

REMARKS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Office Action mailed on December 29, 2006, which has been reviewed and carefully considered. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the amendments made above and the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

By means of the present amendment, the current Abstract has been deleted and substituted with the enclosed New Abstract which better conforms to U.S. practice. Further, the specification has been amended for better conformance with the figures.

By means of the present amendment, claims 1-11 have been amended for better conformance to U.S. practice, such as beginning the dependent claims with 'The' instead of 'A', and changing "characterized in that" to --wherein--. Claims 1-11 were not amended in order to address issues of patentability and Applicants respectfully reserve all rights under the Doctrine of Equivalents.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings because of lack of the label --Prior Art-- in FIG 1. In response, --Prior Art-- has been added to FIG 1. Further, FIG 3 has been

amended to include reference numerals 30, 31 and 32, in conformance with the specification, such as page 6, lines 10-18 and lines 24-29. Replacement sheets including FIGs 1 and 3 are enclosed. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the drawings objection and approval of the enclosed proposed drawing changes.

In the Office Action, claims 4-5 and 9 are objected to for certain informalities. In response, claims 4-5 and 9 have been amended to remove the informalities noted by the Examiner, as well as other informalities. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to claims 4-5 and 9 is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as allegedly indefinite. Further, claims 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101. Without agreeing with the Examiner, and in the interest of advancing prosecution, claims 9-11 have been amended to remove the alleged informalities noted by the Examiner. It is respectfully submitted that the rejections of claims 9-11 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, and §101 have been overcome and an indication as such is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-2 and 4-7 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No, 6,272,024 (Uchida). Further, claims 3 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Uchida. It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-18 are patentable over Uchida for at least the following reasons.

Uchida is directed to a DC-to-DC converter having an improved surge suppressor 6a shown in FIG 4 for example. A prior art surge suppressor 6 is also shown in FIG 1. As clearly shown in FIGS 1 and 4, the diode 16, 21 is NOT directly connected across the primary winding of a transformer. Rather, in FIG 1, a diode 16 in series with a parallel connection of capacitor 17 and resistor 18, are connected the transformer primary winding. Similarly in FIG 4, a diode 21 in series with another circuit (comprising the capacitor 17 and resistor 18 as well as another resistor 20) are connected to the transformer primary winding. That is, Uchida teaches to add additional elements, namely, the resistor 20 (in addition to the capacitor 17 and resistor 18) between the diode 21 and the transformer primary winding, to provide better surge protection.

In stark contrast, the present invention as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claims 7

and 12, amongst other patentable elements, requires (illustrative emphasis provided) :

a diode is directly coupled in parallel to the primary winding for demagnetizing the transformer during the off-time of the switch, the on-time and the off-time of the switch being predetermined.

A diode which is directly coupled in parallel to the primary winding is nowhere taught or suggested in Kamoi. Rather, Uchida to connect additional elements besides the diode in parallel to the primary winding, namely, the capacitor 17, resistor 18 and another resistor 20. Thus, Uchida teaches away from a diode which is directly coupled in parallel to the primary winding.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1, 7 and 12 should be allowable, and allowance thereof is respectfully requested. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-6, 8-11 and 13-18 should also be allowed at least based on its dependence from independent claims 1, 7 and 12.

In addition, Applicants deny any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the

presented remarks. However, the Applicants reserve the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Dicran Halajian, Reg. 39,703
Attorney for Applicant(s)
March 8, 2007

Enclosure: Replacement drawing sheet (2 sheets including
FIGs 1 and 3)
New Abstract

THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP
Applied Technology Center
111 West Main Street
Bay Shore, NY 11706
Tel: (631) 665-5139
Fax: (631) 665-5101